AD-A077 972 HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION ALEXANDRIA VA F/G 12/1
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF FORT HOOD QUALITY-OF-LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE--ETC(U)
OCT 78 B B GRAY , K RIGG DAHC19-75-C-0025
UNCLASSIFIED ARI-RM-78-25 NL

1 OF 1
AD A077972

END
DATE FILMED
1-80
DDC

LEVEL II

(1)

Research Memorandum 78-25

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF FORT HOOD QUALITY-OF-LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE

Burl B. Gray and Kay Rigg
Human Resources Research Organization

ARI FIELD UNIT AT FORT HOOD, TEXAS

U. S. Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

October 1978

Army Project Number
2Q763743A775

Human Performance
in Field Assessment
DAHC19-75-C-0025

Research Memorandum 78-25

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF FORT HOOD QUALITY-OF-LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE

Burl B. Gray [redacted] Kay Rigg
Human Resources Research Organization

Submitted by:
George M. Gividen, Chief
ARI FIELD UNIT AT FORT HOOD, TEXAS

Oct[redacted]978

Approved by:

A. H. Birnbaum, Acting Director
Organizations and Systems
Research Laboratory

Joseph Zeidner, Technical Director
U.S. Army Research Institute for
the Behavioral and Social Sciences

405 260

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF FORT HOOD QUALITY-OF-LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. DATA

The tape received from Fort Hood containing the QOL questionnaire data from 1975 and 1976 was read and those responses corresponding to the population of interest in this analysis were reproduced on cards. The population that was actually analyzed consisted of 215 subjects. Responses to questions that were not necessary in the analysis were not extracted from the tape.

The format of the cards used in the analysis is:

Columns	Question	Variable Name	Value Range	Missing Values
1-4	Group & Subject ID	——	7001-9023	——
5-6	*B1	AGE	17-37	00
7	B2	SEX	0-2	0
8	B3	PAY	0-7	0
9	B5	MOS	0-2	0
10	B10	**RACE	0-7	0
11-12	B11	***EDUC	91-95 & 00	00
13	B15	COURSES	0-2	0
14	77	TRAIN1	0-5	0
15	78	TRAIN2	0-5	0
16	86	JOBSUIT	0-5	0
17-19	1	JOBHOURS	0-999	999
20-22	2	JOBHOURM	0-999	999
23-24	7a	CSPS	0-99	99
25-26	7b	TSPS	0-99	99
27-28	8a	CSPL	0-99	99
29-30	8b	TSPL	0-99	99
31-32	9a	C1S	0-99	99
33-34	9b	T1S	0-99	99
35-36	10a	CCTBC	0-99	99
37-38	10b	TCTBC	0-99	99
39-40	11a	CBSC	0-99	99
41-42	11b	TBSC	0-99	99
43-44	12a	CBSD	0-99	99
45-46	12b	TBSD	0-99	99
47	13a	CTBCPOL	0-6	0
48	13b	TALKPROB	0-2	0
49-50	13c	HOWMANY	00-99	00

Columns	Question	Variable Name	Value Range	Missing Values
51	13e	OPENDOOR	0-6	0
52	84	TRAININF	0-6	0
53	87	OFFUNDER	0-6	0
54	88	NCOUNTER	0-6	0
55	90	OFFDUTY	0-6	0
56	97	TRANSPOR	0-6	0
57	19	READFREQ	0-9	0
58	14a	CHAPLAIA	0-6	0
59	14b	CHAPLAIB	0-6	0
60	14c	CHAPLAIC	0-6	0
61	3	FIRSTAID	0-4	0
62	4	WOUND	0-4	0
63	5	MAP	0-4	0
64	82	COURTESY	0-5	0
65	83	DISCIPLI	0-5	0
66	81	HARRASS	0-5	0
67	92d	SATISD	0-6	0
68	92e	SATISE	0-6	0
69	92f	SATISF	0-6	0
70	92g	SATISG	0-6	0
71	94	THEFT	0-2	0
72-73	95	THEFTNUM	0-9	0
74	89	MINETRT	0-6	0
75	91	RAPS	0-6	0
76	96	FEMALEUT	0-6	0
77	85	OPINION	0-5	0
78	79	BCAREER	0-5	0
79	80	ACAREER	0-5	0
80	99	RECOMMEN	0-5	0

* Question numbers preceded by B indicate that the question was contained in the background section of the questionnaire.

** RACE (B10) was recoded for the analysis as follows:
- 0 American Indian, Mexican American, Oriental, Puerto Rican, other
- 1 Black
- 2 Caucasian

*** EDUC (B11) was recoded for the analysis as follows:
- 0 No answer
- 1 Less than 12 years
- 2 12 years
- 3 Over 12 years

The variable names were selected to correspond in a natural manner with the questions represented.

Analysis tasks were requested for questions 13d, 92a, 92b, 92c, and 92h, but no data were available for those questions. Also, in some cases the missing data were so extensive that no analysis could be performed.

II. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

The first set of analysis was a 3-factor ANOVA using a factorial design with race, sex, and educational level comprising the three factors and several variables used as dependent variables. The hypothesized models were of the form:

$$Y_{ijkl} = u + RACE_i + SEX_j + EDUC_k + RACExSEX_{ij} + RACExEDUC_{ik} + SEXxEDUC_{jk} + RACExSEXxEDUC_{ijk} + e_{ijkl} \quad (1)$$

$i = 1,2;\ j = 1,2;\ k = 1,2,3.$

The variables used as dependent variables, y_{ijkl}, in the ANOVA were:

Question	Variable Name	Question	Variable Name
B1	AGE	12a	CBSD
B3	PAY	12b	TBSD
B5	MOS	13a	CTBCPOL
B15	COURSES	13b	TALKPROB
1	JOBHOURS	13c	HOWMANY
2	JOBHOURM	13e	OPENDOOR
3	FIRSTAID	14a	CHAPLAIA
4	WOUND	14b	CHAPLAIB
5	MAP	14c	CHAPLAIC
7a	CSPS	19	READFREQ
7b	TSPS	77	TRAIN1
8a	CSPL	78	TRAIN2
8b	TSPL	79	BCAREER
9a	CIS	80	ACAREER
9b	TIS	81	HARRASS
10a	CCTBC	82	COURTESY
10b	TCTBC	83	DISCIPLI
11a	CBSC	84	TRAININF
11b	TBSC	85	OPINION

Question	Variable Name	Question	Variable Name
86	JOBSUIT	92e	SATISE
87	OFFUNDER	92f	SATISF
88	NCOUNTER	92g	SATISG
89	MINETRT	94	THEFT
90	OFFDUTY	95	THEFTNUM
91	RAPS	96	FEMALEUT
92d	SATISD	97	TRANSPOR
		99	RECOMMEN

With the factorial design (1), we can assess not only the effects of race, sex, and educational level on the questionnaire responses but also interaction effects. In this particular analysis, there are several likely interaction effects. For example, black female soldiers may respond to a given question in a manner different from blacks or other female soldiers in general. If so, a test for interaction effects should detect such a difference.

In all, this set of analysis consisted of 53 separate ANOVAs. The analysis were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and the output from those runs is attached. Below is a summary of those runs where significant effects due to race, sex, education, or their interactions were determined. Listed are the dependent variables and only those factors that were significant at a significance level of x = 0.10. Also, given is the actual level of significance for each case so that if a lower value of x is desired one will know which cases to delete.

TABLE 1. 3-FACTOR ANOVA SUMMARY

Dependent Variable	Significant Factors (Sign. Level)
1. AGE (B1)	EDUC (.017)
2. PAY (B3)	RACE (.079)
3. MOS (B5)	RACExEDUC (.011)
4. COURSES (B15)	EDUC (.045), RACExEDUC (.040)
5. TRAIN1 (77)	RACE (.008)
6. TRAIN2 (78)	RACE (.068)
7. JOBSUIT (86)	RACE (.013)

Dependent Variable	Significant Factors (Sign. Level)
8. CSPS (7A)	RACExEDUC (.028)
9. TSPS (7B)	RACE (.104)
10. T1S (9B)	SEX (.021), SEXxEDUC (.045)
11. TCTBC (10B)	SEXxEDUC (.014)
12. TBSC (11B)	SEX (.007), SEXxRACE (.016), SEXxEDUC (.022)
13. TRAININF (84)	RACE (.067)
14. NCOUNTER (88)	SEXxRACExEDUC (.108)
15. OFFDUTY (90)	EDUC (.051)
16. TRANSPOR (97)	SEX (.036), RACE (.013), SEXxRACExEDUC (.068)
17. TBSD (12B)	SEX (.009), SEXxEDUC (.030)
18. CTBCPOL (13A)	RACE (.077), EDUC (.001)
19. READFREQ (19)	RACE (.103), SEXxRACE (.029)
20. CHAPLAIA (14A)	SEXxEDUC (.052)
21. CHAPLAIB (14B)	RACE (.012), EDUC (.017), SEXxEDUC (.002)
22. FIRSTAID (3)	RACE (.107), EDUC (.062)
23. WOUND (4)	RACE (.092), EDUC (.028)
24. MAP (5)	RACE (.004)
25. DISCIPLI (83)	RACE (.096)
26. SATISD (92D)	SEX (.104)
27. SATISF (92F)	RACE (.040)
28. SATISG (92G)	RACE (.041)
29. THEFTNUM (95)	RACE (.102)
30. MINETRT (89)	RACE (.007)
31. FEMALEUT (96)	RACE (.003)

SUMMARY OF RUNS WHERE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS WERE OBSERVED

In addition to the ANOVAs, multiple classification analyses (MCA) were also performed for each dependent variable to point out the differences in means among the levels of the 3 factors. The MCAs are included with the computer output for the ANOVAs. The statistical estimates of the effects (assuming no interaction effects) due to SEX, RACE, and EDUC for the various dependent variables are contained in the MCAs.

III. CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS

After the 3-factor ANOVAs were run and some significant effects were determined, a correlation analysis was conducted to measure the strength of the relationships. Since SEX and RACE were dichotomous variables, point

biserial correlation coefficients were estimated for relationships involving SEX and RACE. For EDUC, which had only 3 discrete values, contingency coefficients were used to measure the strength of the relationships involving the factor EDUC. The SPSS package does not contain a point biserial correlation program but the necessary information is contained in the results of a t-test for analysis of the difference in means of two samples. The attached computer output contains the results of the t-tests. The point biserial correlation coefficient was determined from the results of the t-tests using the identity:

$$r_{pb} = \sqrt{\frac{T}{1 + T}}$$

where r_{pb} is the point biserial correlation coefficient, $T = \frac{t^2}{n_1+n_2-2}$, t is the t ratio found in the computer output, n_1 is the number of observations in group one and n_2 is the number of observations in group two. The sign of r_{pb} is the same as the sign of the t ratio. For example, in the first case shown on page 4 of the t-test output there is a breakdown of the responses for the dependent variable TBSD into two groups according to sex (group 1 is male, group 2 is female). There are n_1=152 observations in group 1 and n_2 = 10 observations in group 2. The t value is t = -2.09. The point biserial correlation estimate is given by:

$$T = \frac{t^2}{n_1+n_2-2} = \frac{(-2.09)^2}{152+10-2} = .0273$$

$$r_{pb} = \sqrt{\frac{T}{1 + T}} = -0.163$$

(the sign is determined by the sign of the t-value). The point biserial correlation coefficients for those relationships that were found to be significant in the ANOVAs are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2. POINT BISERIAL CORRELATIONS
DEPENDENT VARIABLES WITH RACE AND SEX

Variables	r_{pb}	Significance Level
TBSD - SEX	-0.163	(.038)
SATISD - SEX	-0.151	(.032)
TIS - SEX	-0.159	(.030)
TBSC - SEX	-0.176	(.024)
*TRANSPOR - SEX	-0.086	(.213)
PAY - RACE	-0.113	(.135)
TRAIN1 - RACE	+0.203	(.008)
TRAIN2 - RACE	+0.150	(.052)
JOBSUIT - RACE	-0.146	(.053)
TSPS - RACE	-0.125	(.123)
TRAININF - RACE	+0.136	(.072)
TRANSPOR - RACE	-0.177	(.018)
CHAPLAIB - RACE	+0.185	(.018)
FIRSTAID - RACE	-0.097	(.202)
WOUND - RACE	-0.090	(.234)
MAP - RACE	-0.209	(.005)
DISCIPLI - RACE	+0.142	(.059)
SATISF - RACE	-0.156	(.040)
SATISG - RACE	-0.167	(.032)
THEFTNUM - RACE	+0.200	(.079)
MINETRT - RACE	-0.314	(.000)
FEMALEUT - RACE	-0.232	(0.002)
CTBCPOL - RACE	+0.141	(0.060)

* The significance of SEX on the responses concerning TRANSPOR were probably due to the interaction effect of sex, race, and education.

Contingency tables were used to measure the relationships between EDUC and the dependent variables for those cases where EDUC was significant. Table 3 presents a summary of the chi square tests and the contingency coefficients. The contingency tables and the statistics are given in the attached computer output.

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF CONTINGENCY TABLE ANALYSIS

Variables	Chi Square	DF	(Sign. Level)	Contingency Coefficient
CTBCPOL - EDUC	17.76	10DF	(0.059)	0.279
CHAPLAIB - EDUC	18.55	10DF	(0.046)	0.292
OFFDUTY - EDUC	9.20	8DF	(0.326)	0.206
FIRSTAID - EDUC	10.39	6DF	(0.109)	0.218
WOUND - EDUC	12.78	6DF	(0.047)	0.238
COURSES - EDUC	4.91	2DF	(0.086)	0.152
AGE - EDUC	42.04	26DF	(0.024)	0.407

IV. T-TESTS WITH MOS (B5) AS GROUPING VARIABLE

A series of t-tests was performed with question B5, dealing with MOS, used to partition the population of responses into two groups. The purpose of these tests was to determine if there is any significant difference between the responses of those soldiers due to duty MOS being the same as their primary MOS. Table 4 gives a summary of the t-tests showing the dependent variables, the t-values, and the significance levels (two-sided). Group 1 represents those subjects whose duty MOS is the same as the primary MOS; group 2 consists of those subjects whose duty and primary MOS differ.

TABLE 4. T-TESTS WITH MOS GROUPING

Variable	$\bar{y}_1$	$\bar{y}_2$	t	Sign. Level (2 sided)	Significant at $\alpha = .10$
JOBHOURS 1	46.712	41.838	2.34	(.021)	√
JOBHOURM 2	31.916	25.354	2.75	(.007)	√
TRAIN1 77	3.155	2.800	1.84	(.068)	√
TRAIN 2 78	3.402	2.652	3.84	(.000)	√
BCAREER 79	3.631	3.643	-0.07	(.947)	NO
ACAREER 80	2.237	2.232	0.03	(.980)	NO
OPINION 85	2.164	2.043	0.80	(.424)	NO
JOBSUIT 86	3.269	2.986	1.50	(.134)	NO
FEMALEUT 96	3.672	3.886	-1.01	(.312)	NO
RECOMMEN 99	2.508	2.309	1.06	(.290)	NO

V. T-TESTS WITH COURSES (B15) AS GROUPING VARIABLE

As in the previous section, analysis were performed to test for the difference in means of two groups determined by the subjects responses to question B15 concerning taking courses. Group 1 consists of those currently taking courses, and group 2 is composed of those not taking courses. Table 5 summarizes the results. The computer output is attached.

TABLE 5. T-TEST WITH COURSES GROUPING

Variable	$\bar{y}_1$	$\bar{y}_2$	t	Sign. Level (2 sided)	Significant $\alpha = .10$
JOBHOURS 1	42.818	45.823	-1.34	(.181)	NO
READFREQ 19	2.568	2.447	0.33	(.739)	NO
TRAIN1 77	3.114	2.987	0.56	(.576)	NO
TRAIN2 78	3.095	3.140	-0.19	(.850)	NO
JOBSUIT 86	3.429	3.097	1.49	(.138)	NO
MINETRT 89	3.581	3.274	1.30	(.195)	NO
OFFDUTY 90	3.214	3.259	-0.22	(.824)	NO
RAPS 91	3.886	3.550	1.35	(.179)	NO
SATISG 92G	2.837	2.855	-0.08	(.936)	NO
RECOMMEN 99	2.721	2.358	1.68	(.094)	√

VI. ANOVAs WITH PAY AS SINGLE FACTOR

A series of ANOVAs were conducted with PAY as the independent (grouping) variable and the following questions as dependent variables.

CSPS	7A	CBSD	12A
TSPS	7B	TBSD	12B
CSPL	8A	CTBCPOL	13A
TSPL	8B	*TALKPROB	13B
CIS	9A	*HOWMANY	13C
TIS	9B	OPENDOOR	13E
CCTBC	10A	TRAININF	84
TCTBC	10B	OFFUNDER	87
CBSC	11A	NCOUNTER	88
TBSC	11B	SATISG	92G

* The analysis for these dependent variables had over 90% missing data.

The hypothesized model was: $y_{ij} = u + PAY_i + e_{ij}$

Pay was not a significant factor for any of the dependent variables listed above. The computer output for the one-factor ANOVAs is attached.

VII. CORRELATIONS INVOLVING JOB HOURS

The next set of analysis was the calculation of correlations between responses to questions 1 and 2 concerning hours per week spent on the job, labeled JOBHOURS and JOBHOURM here, and various other questions about the attitudes of the subjects. Nonparametric correlations were calculated to avoid any distributional problems. Table 6 presents the correlation results for this phase of the study.

TABLE 6. CORRELATIONS INVOLVING JOBHOURS AND JOBHOURM

Variable Pair	Correlation Coeff.	Sign. Level	Sign. at x=.10
JOBHOURS WITH TRAIN1 77	-0.021	(.765)	NO
JOBHOURS WITH TRAIN2 78	+0.069	(.332)	NO
JOBHOURS WITH JOBSUIT 86	+0.006	(.931)	NO
JOBHOURS WITH SATISG 92g	-0.043	(.555)	NO
JOBHOURS WITH RECOMMEN 99	-0.052	(.457)	NO
JOBHOURM WITH TRAIN1 77	+0.211	(.003)	√
JOBHOURM WITH TRAIN2 78	+0.223	(.002)	√
JOBHOURM WITH JOBSUIT 86	+0.132	(.062)	√
JOBHOURM WITH SATISG 92g	+0.225	(.002)	√
JOBHOURM WITH RECOMMEN 99	+0.115	(.104)	√

As shown in Table 6 there were no statistically significant correlations between JOBHOURS and the selected variables (one cannot reject the hypothesis that the true correlations are zero). However, all of the correlations involving JOBHOURM (meaningful hours on the job) were significant at the .10 level.

Partial correlations were also calculated for JOBHOURS and JOBHOURM with ACAREER (question 80) controlling for the responses to BCAREER (question 79). These give an indication of the strength of the relationship between job hours and the respondents feeling about making the Army a

career after adjusting for the respondents feelings about the Army as a career when they first went on active duty. The partial correlations are given in Table 7.

TABLE 7. PARTIAL CORRELATIONS JOBHOURS, JOBHOURM BY ACAREER CONTROLLING FOR BCAREER

Variables	Partial Correlation	Significance Level
JOBHOURS BY ACAREER / BCAREER	-0.070	(0.164)
JOBHOURM BY ACAREER / BCAREER	+0.178	(0.006)

VIII. CORRELATIONS INVOLVING SUBJECTS' OPINIONS ABOUT THE ARMY AND THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS TO FRIENDS

The responses to questions 85, 99, and 80, (OPINION, RECOMMEN, ACAREER), dealing with the subjects' opinions about the Army and their recommendations to friends, were analyzed to determine if they were correlated with their feelings about various conditions of the QOL at Fort Hood. Any significant correlations would suggest changes that the Army should make at Fort Hood in order to make the Army more attractive to the enlisted soldiers. The correlations are displayed in Table 8.

TABLE 8. CORRELATIONS INVOLVING OPINIONS AND CONDITIONS

Variable Pair	Correlation	Sign. Level	Sign. at x=.10
TRAIN1 (77) WITH OPINION	.385	(.001)	√
TRAIN2 (78) WITH OPINION	.349	(.001)	√
HARRASS (81) WITH OPINION	.411	(.001)	√
COURTESY (82) WITH OPINION	.282	(.001)	√
DISCIPLI (83) WITH OPINION	.260	(.001)	√
JOBSUIT (86) WITH OPINION	.247	(.001)	√
OFFDUTY (90) WITH OPINION	.243	(.001)	√
SATISD (92d) WITH OPINION	-.084	(.237)	NO
SATISE (92e) WITH OPINION	.127	(.068)	√
SATISF (92f) WITH OPINION	.089	(.201)	NO
SATISG (92g) WITH OPINION	.301	(.001)	√
TRANSPOR (97) WITH OPINION	.122	(.076)	√

Variable Pair	Correlation	Sign. Level	Sign. at x=.10
TRAIN1 WITH RECOMMEN	.296	(.001)	√
TRAIN2 WITH RECOMMEN	.210	(.003)	√
HARRASS WITH RECOMMEN	.473	(.001)	√
COURTESY WITH RECOMMEN	.287	(.001)	√
DISCIPLI WITH RECOMMEN	.194	(.005)	√
JOBSUIT WITH RECOMMEN	.273	(.001)	√
OFFDUTY WITH RECOMMEN	.178	(.011)	√
SATISD WITH RECOMMEN	.043	(.547)	NO
SATISE WITH RECOMMEN	.274	(.001)	√
SATISF WITH RECOMMEN	.215	(.002)	√
SATISG WITH RECOMMEN	.266	(.001)	√
TRANSPOR WITH RECOMMEN	.043	(.533)	NO

In most cases shown in Table 8 there is evidence of significant correlation between the opinions and thoughts about the Army and the conditions at Fort Hood. A partial correlation analysis was undertaken to explore the relationship between the subjects' views of the Army as a career and the conditions at Fort Hood controlling for their views about the Army before they went on active duty. This would show if the conditions at Fort Hood were related to changes in views about the Army as a career. The partial correlations are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9. PARTIAL CORRELATIONS WITH ACAREER ADJUSTED FOR BCAREER

Variables	Partial Correlation	Significance Level	Significant at x=.10
77 TRAIN1 WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.309	(.001)	√
78 TRAIN2 WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.274	(.001)	√
86 JOBSUIT WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.232	(.001)	√
82 COURTESY WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.337	(.001)	√
83 DISCIPLI WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.186	(.007)	√
81 HARRASS WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.439	(.001)	√
90 OFFDUTY WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.143	(.029)	√
92d SATISD WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	-.086	(.130)	NO
92e SATISE WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.068	(.185)	NO
92f SATISF WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.009	(.455)	NO
92g SATISG WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.175	(.010)	√
97 TRANSPOR WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.027	(.363)	NO

Table 9 reveals several significant relationships between conditions at Fort Hood and the subject's attitudes about the Army as a career. Particulary prominent are the relationships involving harrassment and courtesy.

IX. CORRELATIONS CONCERNING UTILIZATION OF FEMALE MILITARY PERSONNEL

The last analysis explored the relationship between the responses to question 96 concerning the utilization of female military personnel (FEMALEUT) and the respondents' opinions about the Army. The analysis used only those responses by the female military personnel; consequently, the sample size was only 12. The correlations (partial correlations) are displayed in Table 10.

TABLE 10. CORRELATIONS CONCERNING FEMALE UTILIZATION

Variables	Correlation	Sign. level	Significant at x = .10
FEMALEUT WITH OPINION	.3924	(.207)	NO
FEMALEUT WITH RECOMMEN	.2723	(.392)	NO
*FEMALEUT WITH ACAREER/BCAREER	.5910	(.028)	√
*Partial Correlation			

The correlations were relatively large, but because of the small sample sizes, only the partial correlation is statistically significant. (One cannot reject the hypothesis that the true correlations are zero in the first two cases even though the estimated coefficients are relatively large.) The computer runs are attached.

SUMMARY

The objective of this work was to provide supplementary data analyses of data abstracted from the Quality-of-Life questionnaire developed earlier at the Fort Hood Field Unit at the request of Headquarters, TRADOC Combined Arms Test Activity (TCATA).

The Quality-of-Life questionnaire data were transmitted to HumRRO on magnetic tape. The tape was read and the required data reproduced on cards. The data consisted of the responses of 215 individuals to the Quality-of-Life questionnaire. These data were then intensively analyzed using analysis of variance and correlational techniques. The results of these analyses are presented in the report.

The analyses described in the report will be used to further the ongoing effort to clarify the variables which moderate satisfaction with Army life at Fort Hood.